

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on November 26, 2003 with claims 1 through 25. Claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16- 25 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1, 13 and 25 are proposed to be amended. This amendment is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination and should be entered.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 13, 20 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. (United States Patent No. 7,062,655) in view of Ogura et al. (United States Publication No. 2004/0078603) in view of Beeferman (United States Publication No. 2002/0156778) and in view of Eitel (United States Patent No. 7,043,521). Claims 2, 7, 11, 14, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, in view of Ogura, Beeferman, Eitel and in view of Honarvar et al. (United States Patent No. 7,231,657). Claims 4-6 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, in view of Ogura, Beeferman, Eitel and in view of P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide (May 2002). Claims 9, 10, 12, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson, in view of Ogura, Beeferman, Eitel and Kanevsky.

The Examiner is thanked for the courtesy of a telephone interview on October 8, 2008 in which the present amendment was discussed. The Examiner indicated that he believed that the present amendment distinguished the present invention from the cited references. The Examiner indicated that a new search would be required.

### Independent Claims

Claims 1, 13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nelson et al. in view of Ogura et al. in view of Beeferman and in view of Eitel. The Examiner asserts that Nelson et al. teaches performing an “Internet/database search using keywords derived from said proposed password” Citing Figs. 1 and 3, and col. 4, lines 53-61, col. 6, lines 16-20 (emphasis added).

Nelson et al., however, do not disclose or suggest performing an *Internet* search, where the “Internet search searches contents of the Internet across a plurality of web sites using a search engine tool,” as required by each claim as amended. Rather, Nelson et al. is limited to a lookup in database 112, where a proposed password is checked against existing password quality rules.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 13 and 25.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2, 4-12, 14 and 16-24 are dependent on independent claims 1 and 13, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Nelson et al., Ogura et al., Beeferman, Eitel, Honarvar et al., P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide and Kanevsky et al., because of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 13 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.


Conclusion

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-25, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 22, 2008

Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560